

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-7 have been amended.

The abstract has been amended as requested by the examiner.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Kivolowitz (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,321). Claims 1-7 have been amended to more clearly describe the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. For at least the following reasons, the examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest "a storage means formed of a rewritable non-volatile memory for storing data, wherein said storage means records operation history of the surveillance camera at constant time intervals of a predetermined time period" as recited in claim 1.

In Kivolowitz, operating parameters of the camera 10 that may be relevant to the generation of an image can be stored in a latch 28. However, Kivolowitz fails to disclose or suggest that the operating parameters of the camera are recorded at constant time intervals of a predetermined time period. Thus, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, although Kivolowitz discloses *a remote processing station* with a memory 44 for storing camera parameters, Kivolowitz fails to disclose or suggest that a rewritable non-volatile memory that records operation history of the camera is located in *the camera*. In the present invention, even if a connection between the surveillance camera apparatus and an operation instructing apparatus is cut off, the surveillance camera apparatus can continue storing operation history since the operation history is stored in the storage means of the surveillance camera apparatus. In Kivolowitz, if the remote processing station and the camera are disconnected, the remote processing station is unable to store the operation history of the camera. Therefore, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest a rewritable non-volatile

memory in the camera that records camera operation history during constant time intervals of a predetermined time period. Thus, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

With regards to claim 2, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest the “storage means records an accumulated number of preset operations executed during the predetermined time period as the operation history” as recited in claim 2. As mentioned for claim 1, the operating parameters of the Kivolowitz camera 10 relevant to the generation of an image can be stored in the latch 28. However, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest recording an accumulated number of preset operations. Therefore, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

With regards to claim 3, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest the “storage means records an accumulated number of automatic panning operations executed during the predetermined time period as the operation history” as recited in claim 3. As mentioned for claim 1, the operating parameters of the Kivolowitz camera 10 relevant to the generation of an image can be stored in the latch 28. However, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest recording an accumulated number of automatic panning operations. Therefore, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

With regards to claim 5, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest the “storage means records an accumulated number of filter changing unit operations for changing a filter of the camera executed during the predetermined time period as the operation history” as recited in claim 5. As mentioned for claim 1, the operating parameters of the Kivolowitz camera 10 relevant to the generation of an image can be stored in the latch 28. However, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest that an accumulated number of filter changing unit operations for changing a filter are stored in the latch. Therefore, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

With regards to claim 6, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest the “storage means records an accumulated number of coordinate system resetting operations for resetting coordinate data of the camera executed during the predetermined time period as the operation history” as recited in claim 6. As mentioned for claim 1, the operating parameters of the Kivolowitz camera 10 relevant to the generation

Appl. No. 09/856,889
Amdt. Dated February 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of November 3, 2004

of an image can be stored in the latch 28. However, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest that an accumulated number of coordinate system resetting operations for resetting coordinate data of the camera are stored in the latch. Therefore, Kivolowitz does not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.


In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33623.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:


Suzanne B. Gagnon, Reg. No. 48924

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: February 3, 2005